

1
2
3 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
4 DISTRICT OF NEVADA

5 * * *

6 SHAFIQUE AHMED, ET AL.,

7 Plaintiffs,

8 v.

9 RICHLAND HOLDINGS, INC. DBA
10 ACCTCORP OF SOUTHERN NEVADA,

11 Defendant.

Case No. 2:19-cv-01925-JCM-DJA

ORDER

12 Presently before the Court is Defendant Richland Holdings, Inc.'s Motion to Stay
13 Discovery (ECF No. 11), filed on January 8, 2020. Plaintiff filed a Response (ECF No. 15) on
14 January 22, 2020 and Defendant filed a Reply (ECF No. 18) on January 29, 2020. This matter is
15 also before the Court on the parties' Stipulated Discovery Plan and Scheduling Order (ECF No.
16 17) filed on January 23, 2020. The Court finds this matter properly resolved without a hearing.
17 See Local Rule 78-1.

18 Courts have broad discretionary power to control discovery. *See, e.g., Little v. City of*
19 *Seattle*, 863 F.2d 681, 685 (9th Cir.1988). In deciding whether to grant a stay of discovery, the
20 Court is guided by the objectives of Rule 1 to ensure a just, speedy, and inexpensive
21 determination of every action. *See Kidneigh v. Tournament One Corp.*, 2013 WL 1855764, at *2
22 (D. Nev. May 1, 2013). "The Federal Rules of Civil Procedure do not provide for automatic or
23 blanket stays of discovery when a potentially dispositive motion is pending." *Tradebay, LLC v.*
24 *eBay, Inc.*, 278 F.R.D. 597, 600 (D. Nev. 2011). However, preliminary issues such as
25 jurisdiction, venue, or immunity are common situations that may justify a stay. *See Twin City*
26 *Fire Ins. v. Employers of Wausau*, 124 F.R.D. 653 (D. Nev. 1989); *see also Kabo Tools Co. v.*
27 *Porauto Indus. Co.*, 2013 WL 5947138, at *1 (D. Nev. Oct. 31, 2013) (granting stay based on
28 alleged lack of personal jurisdiction); *Ministerio Roca Solida v. U.S. Dep't of Fish & Wildlife*,

1 288 F.R.D. 500, 506 (D. Nev. 2013) (granting stay based in part on alleged lack of subject matter
2 jurisdiction). Further, motions to stay discovery pending resolution of a dispositive motion may
3 be granted when: (1) the pending motion is potentially dispositive; (2) the potentially dispositive
4 motion can be decided without additional discovery; and (3) the Court has taken a “preliminary
5 peek” at the merits of the potentially dispositive motion to evaluate the likelihood of dismissal.
6 *See Kor Media Group, LLC v. Green*, 294 F.R.D. 579, 581 (D. Nev. 2013).

7 A party seeking to stay discovery pending resolution of a potentially dispositive motion
8 bears the heavy burden of establishing that discovery should be stayed. *See, e.g., Turner*
9 *Broadcasting System, Inc. v. Tracinda Corp.*, 175 F.R.D. 554, 556 (D. Nev. 1997) (noting that a
10 stay of discovery may be appropriate where the complaint was “utterly frivolous, or filed merely
11 for settlement value.”); *Blankenship v. Hearst Corp.*, 519 F.2d 418, 429 (9th Cir. 1975). When
12 deciding whether to issue a stay, a court must take a “preliminary peek” at the merits of the
13 dispositive motion pending in the case. *Tradebay*, 278 F.R.D. at 602-603. In doing so, a court
14 must consider whether the pending motion is potentially dispositive of the entire case, and
15 whether that motion can be decided without additional discovery. *Id.* This “preliminary peek” is
16 not intended to prejudge the outcome, but to evaluate the propriety of a stay of discovery “with
17 the goal of accomplishing the objectives of Rule 1.” *Id.* (citation omitted). That discovery may
18 involve inconvenience and expense is not sufficient, standing alone, to support a stay of
19 discovery. *Turner Broadcasting*, 175 F.R.D. at 556. An overly lenient standard for granting
20 requests to stay would result in unnecessary delay in many cases.

21 After taking a preliminary peek at the pending Motion to Dismiss (ECF No. 6), the Court
22 finds that Defendant has carried its heavy burden of establishing that discovery should be stayed.
23 The issues before the Court in the pending Motion to Dismiss do not require further discovery as
24 the Motion has been fully briefed and if granted is potentially dispositive of the entire case.
25 Additionally, discovery is expensive and to the extent that this case may be resolved prior to
26 discovery, especially on a class-wide basis, serves judicial economy. Finally, having taken a
27 preliminary peek at the Motion to Dismiss, the Court is not convinced that Plaintiff’s complaint
28 as currently plead will survive dismissal, but notes, of course, that its view may be very different

1 than how the assigned district judge will see the motion at issue. As such, the Court finds this is a
2 case where a temporary stay of discovery will further the goal of judicial economy.

3 IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that Defendant Richland Holdings, Inc.'s Motion to Stay
4 Discovery (ECF No. 11) is **granted**.

5 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that in the event the Motion to Dismiss (ECF No. 6) is not
6 granted, the parties shall file a stipulated proposed discovery plan and scheduling order no later
7 than seven days after a decision has been issued by the court.

8 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the parties' Stipulated Discovery Plan and Scheduling
9 Order (ECF No. 17) is **denied without prejudice**.

10
11 DATED: January 30, 2020

12
13 
14 DANIEL J. ALBREGTS
15 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28